· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/812,554	ELDRING ET AL.
	Examiner Sono 6/9/05	Art Unit
	Daniel J. Petkovsek	2874
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperature of the Communication appearance of the Co	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this a portion or other appropriate communication of the communication of the communication is subject and MPEP 1308.	application. If not included on will be mailed in due course. <b>THIS</b>
1. X This communication is responsive to RCE with amendmen	<u>nt filed May 5, 2005</u> .	
2. X The allowed claim(s) is/are 1 and 3-10.		
3. $\boxtimes$ The drawings filed on <u>30 March 2004</u> are accepted by the	Examiner.	
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority una) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority do  International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * Certified copies not received:	e been received. e been received in Application No.	<del></del>
Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONN THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.		ly complying with the requirements
5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be subm INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which giv		
<ol> <li>CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") mutering (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftspers 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date</li> <li>(b) including changes required by the attached Examiner Paper No./Mail Date</li> <li>Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the properties of the properties of</li></ol>	son's Patent Drawing Review(PTo  's Amendment / Comment or in the I.84(c)) should be written on the draw	Office action of vings in the front (not the back) of
<ol> <li>DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT</li> </ol>		
Attachment(s)  1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/I Paper No./Mail Date  4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	6. ☐ Interview Summa Paper No./Mail □ 08), 7. ☐ Examiner's Amen 8. ☑ Examiner's Stater 9. ☐ Other	oate

Art Unit: 2874

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to the RCE with amendment filed May 5, 2005. In accordance with the amendment, claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claims 1 and 5 are in independent format. Claims 1 and 3-10 are pending.

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 5, 2005 has been entered.

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 3-10 are allowed. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for 2. allowance: the relevant prior art of record does not teach or reasonably suggest, in explicit method limitations, the amended material of claim 1, in which the array of optoelectronic devices are hermetically sealed by the lens array itself. The relevant prior art of record does not teach or reasonably suggest the specific method limitations of claim 5 (placing a retainer on a weld plate (including a fiber stub array), aligning the weld plate in the Z direction, and fixing the weld plate to the lens frame), in addition to the original limitations as presented in the original application. The closest prior art of record (Giboney et al. '302 and Sauter et al. '448) do not teach or reasonably suggest these *specific method*-type limitations.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue Art Unit: 2874

fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see arguments with amendment, filed May 5, 2005, with respect to the issue of hermetically sealing component using the lens array itself, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) to Sauter et al. U.S.P. No. 6,056,448; and also the rejections of claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to Giboney et al. US 2003/0091302 A1, and further in view of Sauter et al. U.S.P. No. 6,056,448, have been withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Petkovsek whose telephone number is (571) 272-2355.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rodney Bovernick can be reached on (571) 272-2344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/812,554

Art Unit: 2874

June 9, 2005

AKM ENAYET ULLAH PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 4